

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-3, 10, 18-23 and 32 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support for the claim amendments may be found in the present specification at least at paragraphs 6-7, 32 and 38. No new matter has been added.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-46 are pending with claims 1, 23 and 32 being independent.

Applicants thank Examiners Ingvaldstad and Saltarelli for the courtesies extended to applicants' representative, Mr. Sung Kim, during a personal interview conducted on June 12, 2008. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

1. Claim Objections

The Office Action on page 2 objects to claims 18-22 and 32 because of informalities.

Claims 18-22 have been amended to depend from claim 9 to provide sufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 32 has been amended to recite "one or more media sink components".

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to claims 18-22 and 32 are respectfully requested.

2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6-8, 18-19, 21, 23-25, 28-30, 32, 36-37, 41-43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (6,453,355). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Jones et al. discloses creating a set of data for indicating how to transmit a time related sequence of media data according to a transmission protocol (see col. 7, lines 40-43). Jones et al. discloses a hint track that is used to determine how to packetize media data for transmission to a

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/608,869
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

client computer system (see col. 7, lines 51-59; col. 8, lines 26-30). However, as discussed during the interview, Jones et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of receiving a plurality of media data streams at once in different formats via a control layer; implementing in a media sink one or more state machines to control a state of transfer of the media data streams on a per stream basis, the media sink providing a common interface for processing the media data streams in different formats, as included in independent claim 1 as amended. Independent claims 23 and 32 have been amended to include similar elements.

Therefore, since Jones et al. fails to disclose, or even suggest, each and every element of independent claims 1, 23 and 32, these claims are not anticipated by Jones et al. and are allowable.

Claims 2-3, 6-8, 18-19 and 21 depend from claim 1. Claims 24-25 and 28-30 depend from claim 23. Claims 36-37, 41-43 and 45 depend from claim 32. As discussed above, claims 1, 23 and 32 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the features recited therein, claims 2-3, 6-8, 18-19, 21, 24-25, 28-30, 36-37, 41-43 and 45 are also allowable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 18-19, 21, 23-25, 28-30, 32, 36-37, 41-43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are respectfully requested.

3. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Rejections Based on Jones et al. and Quicktime 6

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 11-17, 20, 22, 26, 33, 38-40, 44 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of “Quicktime 6 API Reference” (hereinafter “Quicktime 6”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Jones et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1, 23 and 32. Quicktime 6 fails to cure this defect.

Quicktime 6 discloses various calls and functions associated with the Quicktime 6 API. However, Quicktime 6 fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of receiving a plurality of

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/608,869
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

media data streams at once in different formats via a control layer; implementing in a media sink one or more state machines to control a state of transfer of the media data streams on a per stream basis, the media sink providing a common interface for processing the media data streams in different formats, as included in independent claim 1 as amended. Independent claims 23 and 32 have been amended to include similar elements.

Therefore, since Jones et al. and Quicktime 6, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1, 23 and 32, these claims are allowable.

Claims 4, 11-17, 20 and 22 depend from claim 1. Claim 26 depends from claim 23. Claims 33, 38-40, 44 and 46 depend from claim 32. As discussed above, claims 1, 23 and 32 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 4, 11-17, 20, 22, 26, 33, 38-40, 44 and 46 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 11-17, 20, 22, 26, 33, 38-40, 44 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

B. Rejections Based on Jones et al. and Dahley et al.

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of Dahley et al. (2005/0132408). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Jones et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 23. Dahley et al. fails to cure this defect.

Dahley et al. discloses a system for controlling multiple input devices (see abstract). Dahley et al. discloses that individual devices can be added and removed from the system while the system is running (see paragraph 107). However, Dahley et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of receiving a plurality of media data streams at once in different formats via a control layer; implementing in a media sink one or more state machines to control a state of transfer of the media data streams on a per stream basis, the media sink providing a common interface for processing the media data streams in different formats, as included in independent claims 1 and 23 as amended.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/608,869
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

Therefore, since Jones et al. and Dahley et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 23, these claims are allowable.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Claim 27 depends from claim 23. As discussed above, claims 1 and 23 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 5 and 27 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

C. Rejections Based on Jones et al. and Introduction to QuickTime

The Office Action rejects claims 9-10, 31 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of “An Introduction to QuickTime” (hereinafter “Introduction to QuickTime”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Jones et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1, 23 and 32. Introduction to QuickTime fails to cure this defect.

Introduction to QuickTime includes a summary of effects, including video effects in movies and effects outside of movies, associated with QuickTime. However, Introduction to QuickTime fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of receiving a plurality of media data streams at once in different formats via a control layer; implementing in a media sink one or more state machines to control a state of transfer of the media data streams on a per stream basis, the media sink providing a common interface for processing the media data streams in different formats, as included in independent claim 1 as amended. Independent claims 23 and 32 have been amended to include similar elements.

Therefore, since Jones et al. and Introduction to QuickTime, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1, 23 and 32, these claims are allowable.

Claims 9-10 depend from claim 1. Claim 31 depends from claim 23. Claims 34-35 depend from claim 32. As discussed above, claims 1, 23 and 32 are allowable. For at least this

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/608,869
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 9-10, 31 and 34-35 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-10, 31 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

4. Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/608,869
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: July 1, 2008

By: /Sung T. Kim/

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398
Attorney for Applicant
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

July 1, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/608,869
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01
Filing Date: June 27, 2003